



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,464	08/15/2005	Tohru Natsume	081356-0235	8195
22428	7590	09/02/2008	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			BORIN, MICHAEL L	
SUITE 500				
3000 K STREET NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			1631	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/02/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/526,464	NATSUME ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael Borin	1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 3-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/21/2006; 03/03/2005.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Status of Claims**

1. Amendment filed 05/22/2008 is acknowledged. Claims 1,2 are canceled. Claims 4-8 are added. Claims 3-8 are pending. Claim 3 remains withdrawn from consideration.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. Applicant submitted the English language abstract of JP-10-132786. Consequently, the reference has been considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. Rejection of claims 1-2 over Egelhofer is withdrawn, first, in view of cancellation of claims 1 and 2. Second , with respect to newly added claims 4-8, Examiner agrees with applicant's argument that the reference does not teach a two-step error analysis as in the steps d),e) of the instant claim 4.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is applied for the following reasons.

A. Claims 4-8 are indefinite due to the lack of clarity of the claim language failing to recite a final process step, which agrees back with the preamble. The method is directed to identifying biopolymers, yet, the last method step is directed to determining a tolerance of the matching step. While minor details are not required in method/process claims, at least the basic step must be recited in a positive, active fashion. The claim does not set forth the conditions/state when the method arrives at biopolymers identification. Clarification is requested via clearer claim wording.

B. Claim 4. Step d): recites the limitation “calibrating ... using theoretical mass...”. As written, it is unclear whether said “using ...” is intended to be an active method step to be practiced in addition to step ..., a further limitation of said comparing as recited in step ..., or an intended use. If the later, claim 1 is indefinite as it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. Clarification is requested via clearer claim language. Incorporation of the steps/equations addressed on pages 7-9 of specification is recommended.

C. Claim 4, step d): The claim, in part, addresses calibration of plurality of mass values using theoretical mass of a single molecule. It is not clear how multiple mass values can be calibrated using a single candidate compound, the latter potentially being unrelated and not having “high similarity score” as required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 4-8 are drawn to a computational method. A statutory process or a system or a computer program product that embodies a statutory process must include a final resulting step of a physical transformation, or produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result (State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.

CAFC 47 USPQ2d 1596 (1998), AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications Inc. (CAFC 50 USPQ2d 1447 (1999)). The instant claims do not result in a physical transformation, thus the Examiner must determine if the instant claims include a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

As noted in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.* CAFC 47 USPQ2d 1596 (1998) below, the statutory category of the claimed subject matter is not relevant to a determination of whether the claimed subject matter produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result:

The question of whether a claim encompasses statutory subject matter should not focus on *which* of the four categories of subject matter a claim is directed to 9--process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter--but rather on the essential characteristics of the subject matter, in particular, its practical utility. Section 101 specifies that statutory subject matter must also satisfy the other "conditions and requirements" of Title 35, including novelty, nonobviousness, and adequacy of disclosure and notice. See *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1359, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1757-58 (Fed. Cir. 1994). For purpose of our analysis, as noted above, claim 1 is directed to a machine programmed with the Hub and Spoke software and admittedly produces a "useful, concrete, and tangible result." *Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1557. This renders it statutory subject matter, even if the useful result is expressed in numbers, such as price, profit, percentage, cost, or loss.

In determining if the claimed subject matter produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, the Examiner must determine each standard individually. For a claim to be "useful," the claim must produce a result that is specific, and substantial. For a claim to be "concrete," the process must have a result that is reproducible. For a claim to be "tangible," the process must produce a real world result. Furthermore, the claim must be limited only to statutory embodiments.

Claims 4-8 do not produce a tangible result. A tangible result requires that the claims must set forth a practical application to produce a real-world result. In the instant claims such as claim 4, the final method step comprises determining tolerance of the calculations made in step b) of the method. Thus, the instant claims are drawn to a method wherein the last steps are processing steps. These steps do not indicate that a

final result has necessarily been determined. Furthermore, the instant claims do not include any indication that the final result has been communicated to the outside world or made otherwise readily accessible. Since the instant claims do not necessarily arrive at a result or communicate a result, the instant claims do not include a tangible result.

This rejection could be overcome by amendment of the claims to recite that a result of the method is outputted to a display or to a user, or by including a final resulting step of a physical transformation, if such wording is supported by the instant specification.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (571) 272-0713. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marjorie Moran can be reached on (571) 272-0720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Borin, Ph.D./  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1631